HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

VOL. XII, NO. 2 — SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1955 — WASHINGTON, D. C.

Democrats to the Fore: As the Democrats, officially implementing their victory over Ike at the polls, organized and took control of the Legislative branch of the Government this week, no one here doubted that they will try to lay the groundwork for taking over completely in 1956, with a regular Democrat for President.

But, if anyone expected that the new masters of Congress would start with a real left-wing program, they were disappointed. Indeed, not a few here wonder if a "new look" for the Democrats is being planned and if that party may not eventually emerge in the guise of "moderate conservatives."

As a sign of such a wind, HUMAN EVENTS exclusively reports that Mr. Carmine DeSapio (whom some Republicans fear will be "running the U.S.A. two years hence") would like to choose as Democratic candidate for the presidency in '56, none other than the moderately conservative Governor of Ohio, Frank J. Lausche. We understand that the boss of Tammany Hall (and the real boss of the newly elected Governor of New York, Averell Harriman) sounded out the ground recently at a very private dinner of Democratic leaders in Manhattan.

Now, it is no secret in Washington that the Democratic Party leadership is far from satisfied with "liberal" Adlai Stevenson and has been "looking around" for an alternative. Nor is there any secret that most of these leaders believe that inevitably Harriman — with his command of the New York convention votes — will come to the top at that convention two years hence (if, of course, his record as Governor is adequate). Nor is there little dissent with the proposition that Mr. DeSapio, Secretary of State in Albany, will fill the state organization with his friends. At the convention, he should wield complete control over the key New York delegation.

Therefore, the news which we report makes no little sense; particularly — in the past two days — as Averell (in the Rauh incident) showed that he wants to disassociate himself with the "liberal" ADA crowd. It is recalled that DeSapio's *tour de force* in the recent campaign was his knifing of "liberal" Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to the delight of New York conservatives, of both parties.

Averell — as time marches on — may not measure up to what DeSapio really wants, but Lausche certainly fills the bill far better. At the last Governors' conference, correspondents rated him first in stature. The Governor of Ohio has a wide following among the devotees of the late Senator Taft. Indeed, in 1950, Lausche actually helped the re-election campaign of Taft and supposedly voted for him. He is no friend of the labor bosses and many Republicans in Ohio are strong for him. It is known that he disapproved of Democratic Senator Burke's anti-McCarthyism (which cost Burke his seat).

Finally, Lausche is a Catholic and, if candidate, would presumably retrieve for the Democrats that crucial vote which in the past decade has been wandering away from its traditional fold and which clinched the 1952 election for Ike. That vote today — because of the McCarthy affair — obviously does not "like Ike." The big "if," of course, is what will the Southern Democrats say.

Republican leaders, to whom we imparted the above news of DeSapio's idea, had the shudders. They foresaw a Democratic landslide with Massachusetts and Rhode Island (remember 1928?) going for Lausche, and of course all the big-city, big-electoral-vote states. They feared that many Taft followers would prefer Lausche to Ike. One GOP leader remarked that several Southern Democratic leaders have spoken favorably of Lausche. One who knows the West said such a friend of Taft would have many

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friends "out there." All bitterly commented on the Ike policy of "driving people out of the party," as the wise Knowland put it. And another took the occasion to say that, in his opinion, Ike will not run in 1956. And so on.

Be that as it may. The dynamic New York boss has "started something." (This is a possibility of which HUMAN EVENTS warned its readers in our March 17, 1954 news section, and again in our June 2 article entitled "Democratic Party Primaries: 1954.") If DeSapio gets the nod from the Southerners (that's the sticker), it will take more than the present inept White House leadership to lay the menace.

State of Union Message: The President's speech drew both plus and minus marks from observers here. A constructive defense policy is seen in the emphasis on air power (instead of mass bayonet fighting) — a reversal from the pattern of last year, and an acceptance of the Taft-Hoover misnamed "sea-air" strategy. On the other hand, there's an apparent backing for the ancient and wasteful UMT (Universal Military Training) proposal, which would pile up masses of infantrymen. Very contradictory in concept — is one military watcher's comment. On the minus side are the words, "affirmative aid for classroom shortage in America." Is this the entering wedge for Federal Aid to Education, as has been feared by those who fight the education monopoly?

Under the Capitol Dome: GOP Senators gave the White House a severe licking in the last 48 hours when the Republicans elected a solid conservative organization: Knowland as Majority Leader; Bridges as Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee; Millikin, Chairman of the Conference Committee; and Bricker, Chairman of the Committee of Committees. The action was camouflaged in the press as "unanimous" — an example of party harmony. Actually, for two months, Max Rabb of the White House Staff has sought to oust Knowland and the others, and to install Senator Smith (N. J.) as Leader and Sen. Bush (Conn.) as head of the Policy Committee. Hence, until the night before, Rabb and his boys were canvassing vigorously, but in the end, just before the caucus meeting, they discovered that they had persuaded only 7 out of 47 GOP Senators! So, they dropped it all; there was no opposition in the elections to Knowland *et al*, and the selection of the conservatives was officially unanimous.

● Scene: office of Senator Kilgore (D., W. Va.), left-wing Democrat and new Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Time: a week before the Democratic organization of the new Senate. Present with Kilgore was Senator Eastland, Democrat from Mississippi, in line for chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee's subdivision, the famous Internal Security Sub-committee (of which Sen. Jenner was chief.) Eastland is a zealous Red hunter and wants to do a real job of getting the pinko brethren out of the Government. But Kilgore was not very cooperative — wanted to butt in on the choice of Eastland's staff, to Eastland's displeasure.

"Well," said Kilgore, "of course I can abolish the Internal Security subcommittee and then you'll have no chairmanship." Eastland, indignant, walked out of the room, with a parting shot, "Yes, and some Democrat can vote with the Republicans to organize the Senate under their leadership, and then you'll have no chairmanship." But ten minutes later, he got a phone call from Kilgore who said: "You win. Go ahead and run your show with the staff you want."

Two lessons are drawn from this incident, which has enlivened the talk in the Senatorial cloakrooms. (1) The shadow of "realignment" hangs over the narrow margin of Democratic control of the Senate; (2) one Democrat, at least, Eastland, may loom as the biggest thorn in the side of the Republican Administration since McCarthy. It is rumored that Eastland wanted to vote against the censure of McCarthy but yielded to pressure from the Democratic leadership, which desired above all to split the GOP.

U.S. Aid to France: The average citizen, if asked to guess what nation has received the most aid from the United States since the end of World War II, would probably pick Britain without hesitation. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fact is that France has received more than any other nation on our prodigal foreign bounty rolls as of June 30, 1954.

Here follows an analysis based on figures from Government statisticians (as we explained in last week's chapter of this series), detailing for the first time in public print the total burden of our foreign aid.

Last week we pointed out that total U.S. aid (civilian and military) to Britain since the end of the second World War amounts to $10,206,416,000. But total French aid comes to $10,646,693,000. This total is broken down into:

(a) $371,469,000 of lend-lease after the end of the war. The termination of the war should have automatically cut off all lend-lease but the French like the British pulled a clear gouge of over one-third of a billion dollars apiece;

(b) $3,812,000 from UNRRA and $60,000 in post UNRRA aid;

(c) $311,388,000 described as interim aid;

(d) $3,188,816,000 from ECA, MSA and FOA (direct economic assistance);

(e) $2,146,000 from the American Red Cross;

(f) $15,850,000 in surplus commodities;

(g) $2,552,000 for the Technical Exchange Program.

Thus the total economic assistance to France came to $3,896,093,000.

Total credit extended to France from American credit sources added up to $1,910,900,000 which is broken down into:

(a) $1,233,698,000 in direct loans or guaranteed loans from the American Export-Import Bank still outstanding; and

(b) $677,202,000 of credit (still on the cuff) from other government agencies for ships, surplus property, etc.

Total military assistance 1950-54 to France in Europe amounted to $4,003,700,000 and (in addition) for the French war in Indo-China, U.S. taxpayers made available $785,000,000. (During the last years of this war, U.S. taxpayers were carrying over 65 per cent of its total costs.)

A final item of around $51,000,000, representing expenditures by the U.S. Air Force to bring NATO air fields up to U.S. standards, rounds out the total of known aid (civilian and military) to France to $10,646,693,000 — nearly a half billion more than that received by Britain since the conclusion of World War II. The curious thing about the billions lavished on France by the United States is that in spite of numerous warnings that France was definitely our most risky ally, we continued to open our national purse to her announced needs (frequently bold demands).

The warnings included: (1) The instability of the French political system (more than twenty cabinet ministries have fallen since the end of the war). (2) Two members of the Communist Party became Ministers of the French Air Force and the infiltration of Moscow agents into this vital branch of the French military is widely known. Infiltration of the French government in general is equally well known. In World War II, Nazi-Communist infiltration of the French republic is said to have resulted in France lasting only six weeks in the war and Moscow infiltration is said to be far worse today. (3) Two U.S. Senators, after a trip to France (less than a year ago), stated that key French war industries were under the control of Communist-dominated unions and that the possibilities of effective sabotage were large. (4) The French Communist Party, despite billions in American post-war aid, continues to be a powerful factor in the decisions of the French government.

The solid Communist bloc of around 100 French Deputies was able to cause France to suddenly capitulate in the French Indo-China war, to defeat EDC, and to produce one negative vote against the pact for re-arming Germany. The reversal of the Chamber of Deputies on the last issue by a close margin is regarded by experts here as far from assuring that France will stand firm as an ally if a hot war with Russia develops. They say that French left-wingers, faced with a serious U.S. threat to cut off France from all future American aid, simply decided to remain on our foreign bounty rolls.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ladejinsky Case: The real pitch on the case of the agricultural expert is — according to authoritative sources — as follows: Paradoxically, Secretary of Agriculture Benson was correct in firing Ladejinsky as a security risk; State Department Security officer McLeod was also right in refusing to fire him. Reason: Ladejinsky is a *potential* risk because he has those three sisters in Russia. But you can't *fire* a *potential* risk unless there's more against him than that — hence McLeod's stand, for Ladejinsky was a State Department employee. Yet, Agriculture is right, too, because you can't *hire* a potential risk — and Benson claims that his department was in a position of hiring Ladejinsky away from State.

In short, it's a bureaucratic squabble, not entitled to the cosmic significance attached to it by many. Among the latter are those who want no security legislation.

German Army: The Pentagon regards the last French vote in favor of German rearmament as symbolizing a "shot-gun wedding," and places little reliance on the French contribution to the defense of the West. The army officer bureaucrats have readied detailed plans for the new German force. That Army — if eventually okayed by all — may get under way faster than most press accounts indicate.

But there's a hitch — as serious as the French delay. Old regular army officers are apprehensive that the civilian politicians will try to make the new German military organization a "soft German army," not the traditionally well-led and tough force that we have known. For one thing, the State Department and CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) are said to be opposing a German G2 or Military Intelligence ("eyes and ears" of any army.) CIA reportedly wants to preempt that job for itself — and there is much suspicion of the capability of the CIA among military men here. Also, it is reported that there may be British-American political interference in the choice of German officers who would take charge of the new force. The Pentagon foresees its task as difficult enough without these handicaps.

Foundations and Sex: One of the most valuable achievements of the Reece Committee, probing the big foundations, was its exposure of social science which pretends to reach infallible conclusions for governing human conduct. The Committee pointed out that one of the greatest errors of Marxism is its belief that social scientists can apply a perfect social science and thus "engineer" people into a better life.

The Kinsey Reports (on the testimony of eminent social scientists themselves) were cited as a perfect example of attempting to use the techniques of social science to accomplish the impossible, i.e., to test people by statistical samples to see whether they or society would be better off if they had "extra-marital sex relations." Unable to use the true experimental method of the natural scientist, the social scientist all too often relies on the statistical method of "merely counting noses" — a process subject to many possibilities of error.

Commenting on the Kinsey Reports, the Committee said: "Studies such as the Kinsey Reports, for example, might disclose that a certain number of people *seem* to have become maladjusted because of lack of sex experience at an early age, or because they maintained the sanctity of the marriage bond. To conclude from such limited and questionable observations that the general public would be better off through early sex experience, or by ignoring the sanctity of marriage, would be unwarranted. Various errors of observation would be unavoidable in such a collection of statistical material. Were the interviewed cases truly a population cross-section? Were the cases selected at random, or only by the volunteer method? Was there a check (and could there be?) made to take into account the relationship between volunteering and 'normality?' Did all the cases tell the truth?

"All that a study such as a Kinsey report can prove is that 'other forms of sexual behavior such as premarital intercourse, prostitution, extra-marital intercourse and homosexual behavior *sometimes* occur among *some* members of *some* segments of the population'. . . .

"Many years of labor, and very large amounts of the public's money, contributed by the Rockefeller Foundation, were expended *to produce this stupendous fact.* [Our italics.] This is perhaps as good an example as any of the extremely limited positive value (combined with extremely grave possibilities of adverse social effect) of much of the empirical research in the social sciences — research for which the public's money is employed through foundation grants."

Between Covers: Watch for publication, January 14, of *Admiral Kimmel's Story*, written by the Admiral himself and appearing for the first time in complete book form, 206 pp., with charts. Published by the Henry Regnery Company, 20 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill. Price — $3.75.

● Out this week, a 72-page pamphlet, "Coalition Now! — a Realistic Program of Political Realignment," by J. Harvie Williams (contributor to HUMAN EVENTS). The case for electoral college reform (containing a plea for the current Mundt-Coudert proposed amendment) and for joint North-South conservative reorganization of the Congress. Mr. Williams offers a solution to the problem of committee chairmanships.

One Day Later: As announced last week, this issue reaches you ONE DAY LATER than heretofore. REASON: HUMAN EVENTS is now covering Washington developments to Friday instead of up to Wednesday.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $6. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.50, six months $6.50. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $13; foreign (regular mail) one year, $12. Foreign airmail, $18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. *Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.* Bound annual volume with index, $15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 2 HUMAN EVENTS January 8, 1955

MENTAL BEHAVIOR IN THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS

By MEDFORD EVANS

ATOMIC SCIENTISTS (the capitals are essential) are not necessarily scientists at all. Their leading organization, the Federation of American Scientists, is a registered political lobby, with a walk-up office at 1749 L Street, N.W., in Washington, across the street from Duke Zeibert's restaurant and around the corner from the Mayflower.

You do not have to be a scientist to belong to the Federation. I know this because I was asked to join by the President of one of its constituent organizations. He knew very well that I was not a scientist. He assumed that I might help with the propaganda. I am sure it never occurred to him that there was anything improper in suggesting membership to me. For, as a scientist himself, he knew that the purpose of the organization was propaganda and not science, and therefore the fact that I was not qualified as a scientist could not hurt the organization.

The trouble is that the very considerable influence of the organization depends on the assumption by the public that the "Federation of American Scientists" is a scientific organization, in the same sense that the American Chemical Society is. It is not. It exists in order to pass resolutions, distribute selected bits of news and influence legislation. A current advertisment contains the following exhortation:

"Join THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, the national organization of scientists in all fields that maintains a 'listening post' for your information and guidance through contacts on Capitol Hill and with the press." That is both frank and accurate. Too modest, really. FAS influence on Capitol Hill is formidable, and with the press almost miraculous. It probably generates more agitprop power per dollar invested than any other political outfit in Washington.

Affiliated with the Federation is the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* While the Federation is frankly political, and registered as a lobby, the *Bulletin* is "educational," and does not pay taxes. It is to some extent subsidized by the Ford Foundation. The Chairman of its "Board of Sponsors" is J. Robert Oppenheimer, and the Vice-Chairman is Harold C. Urey. The Editor is Eugene Rabinowitch. A leading member of the editorial board is Edward A. Shils, who is not a scientist.

The influence of the *Bulletin* is enormous. Its own circulation is small, but its views are reflected punctually in such newspapers as the *Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Washington Post, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, San Francisco Chronicle,* and many other. In fact, never did so many agree so promptly about such important subjects which they understood so little. It has been the same with periodicals. *The Nation, New Republic, Atlantic, Harpers, American Magazine, Look, Newsweek, Police Gazette,* and *Foreign Affairs* may not have much else in common, but they have all remained basically consistent with the position or positions of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.*

NOBODY EVER GOT out of line till the May, 1953 *Fortune* with its "Hidden Struggle over the H-Bomb" foreshadowed the whole Oppenheimer case as we now know it.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Oppenheimer quickly responded. His article on "Atomic Weapons and American Policy" in *Foreign Affairs* for July, 1953, seemed for a while to show Henry Luce who was boss. While *Fortune's* attack on Oppenheimer received no notice at all in the daily press or by other periodicals, Oppenheimer's own essay in *Foreign Affairs* was at once echoed with little cries of demure pleasure in editorial columns from coast to coast. Who would have thought *Foreign Affairs* had such a circulation?

The singular reputation of Dr. Oppenheimer has, of course, never been a matter like the Emperor's new clothes, for he is a man of the most extraordinary abilities; but his influence and that of many of his associates has been shot through with phoniness. Take the Vice-Chairman of the Sponsors of the *Bulletin,* Dr. Harold C. Urey. Urey no doubt earned his reputation as a great scientist. A Nobel Prize winner, he had the basic scientific responsibility during the war for the gaseous-diffusion method of producing U-235. That method is now the accepted one, other methods have been abandoned, and gaseous-diffusion plants have multiplied on a fabulous scale and at fabulous cost. Much of Urey's prestige is due to this fact. Yet General Groves has now revealed of this process that "Dr. Urey, who was the head, violently opposed it. He said it couldn't possibly work."

Earthly fame is a vain thing, as the philosophers have immemorially remarked, but we might as well hit it a lick here and there to set things somewhat straighter if we can. To displace various inflated reputations, I want to nominate for belated recognition A. E. Ballard. Ballard worked at Y-12, the electromagnetic plant at Oak Ridge. He was an industrial chemist who had learned his trade in the Kodak plant. My information is that he deserves major credit for whipping the "recovery" problem at Y-12, which in the words of the Smyth report was "by far the most important chemical problem." If it is true that Ballard is the man who broke this main bottleneck in the way of producing the U-235 for the Hiroshima bomb, then his historical importance is very great. Yet most rather serious readers have never heard of him. He was a good, a vitally important, atomic scientist, but he was not an Atomic Scientist.

Failure to understand the difference between atomic science and Atomic Science causes lots of confusion. Senator McCarthy once listed among atomic scientists whom he alleged to be Communist affiliated one Walter Gellhorn, which seemed like an egregious error on the Senator's part, inasmuch as Gellhorn is a lawyer. As for the other part of the characterization, Louis Budenz has testified under oath that Gellhorn is, or was, a Communist, and Gellhorn under oath has denied it. The point I wish to make is that lawyer Gellhorn, no scientist, has earned his spurs as an Atomic Scientist, for his book *Security, Loyalty, and Science* was given the Hyman Goldsmith Award by the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* for contributing to the "clarification of the right relations between science and politics." The relations between science and politics comprise the exact field of the Atomic Scientist, and obviously a lawyer is just as likely as a scientist to qualify.

YET THE EQUIVOCATION in "Atomic Scientist" is not the whole of the problem. Most atomic scientists are hard-working fellows with high I.Q.'s (the best ones are very hard-working and have very high I.Q.'s) who have all kinds of different ideas about politics, economics and religion. But they seem to have developed a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good deal of class consciousness. My wife and I played bridge one night with an Oak Ridge Laboratory man and his wife. After a successful little-slam bid he said, "There! Another triumph for science!" Of course he was not serious. But neither could you be sure he was joking. It was not very funny anyway. When the evening's play was over, we had won. We did not attribute this to administration or the humanities.

Class consciousness is a vicious thing. The root of it is identifying oneself with the ideals of the class and somehow assuming one is the embodiment of those ideals. "I am the state," said Louis XIV. "I am the Government," said a Federal inspector of whom I once heard. I am science, says many a scientist — when he is not talking to another scientist about scientific matters, which would be the only time he would ever really have any justification for the feeling.

There is a thing which some psychologists call "halo effect." It is used in advertising when athletes, singers, or tycoons endorse cigarettes, etc. People recognized as scientists have acquired this kind of halo. The scientists have it, the Scientists keep it polished. This is not unpleasing to the scientists, but it sometimes interferes with their proper function, which is the exercise of critical intelligence on observed phenomena.

During the Congressional investigation of AEC in 1949, Enrico Fermi, who is a very great scientist — possibly the greatest atomic scientist, was induced by Atomic Science to say a few inherently innocuous but in context ill-chosen words about the natural proclivity of scientists to explore and investigate *everything*, this accounting for their occasionally confronting the conscientious Security Officer with a Problem.

"After all," Fermi said, "science is a matter of investigation into mysteries, and scientists are people who have a natural curiosity, who think that way professionally. They are considered good scientists if they are very prone not to take anything for granted."

Senator Hickenlooper asked, "Is there any criticism, then, on those who have the responsibility for Government to not take anything for granted and to be very sure in investigating the mysteries of people's subversive beliefs?" There was laughter and Fermi said *touché*.

Urbanity like Fermi's is rare in any group, but contrast the attitude of Eugene Rabinowitch, Editor of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists:* "Science became the first profession in America to be exposed to wholesale loyalty investigations. Public accusations and private innuendos did not spare the most distinguished of the scientists." (BAS, December, 1951.) AEC personnel were all investigated, most of them not being scientists. Is there a reason why "the most distinguished of the scientists" should be spared what other citizens are not spared? Private innuendo is pretty sneaky, but how any of us avoid this risk is beyond me. If there is a scientific approach to the matter I'm sure we'll all be happy to listen. As for public accusation, I do not believe we need a law that "the most distinguished of the scientists" shall be exempt from "public accusation." The principle that every man is presumed innocent until proven guilty has the corollary that no man is above investigation or indictment. We are equal before the law.

THE OPPENHEIMER CASE is profoundly disturbing on several counts, not the least being the fact that of nine men who gave official opinions (3 members of the Gray

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Board, the AEC General Manager, and 5 Commissioners), the two who said Oppenheimer ought to be cleared were both scientists. This raises a question whether we are indeed persecuting scientists. Maybe we hate them because they are superior. Or maybe they have excessive professional solidarity.

In my judgment they do, and the worst consequence is that it affects their intelligence. Scientists have no more obligation than anyone else to be honest, kind and patriotic, but they do have more than the average obligation to be intelligent. Now consider the following:

The most startling incident in the Oppenheimer story is the Chevalier affair. The evidence is that Oppenheimer in 1943 gave Military Intelligence one account of a Soviet attempt at atomic espionage involving Haakon Chevalier as a link, then later changed his story, maintaining during the recent hearings that his original narrative had been an elaborate fabrication. Concerning this incident the majority opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission states: "It is not clear today whether the account Dr. Oppenheimer gave to Colonel Pash in 1943 concerning the Chevalier incident or the story he told the Gray Board last month is the true version. If Dr. Oppenheimer lied in 1943, as he now says he did, he committed the crime of knowingly making false and material statements to a Federal officer. If he lied to the Board, he committed perjury in 1954."

That is a clear statement of a dilemma posed by the accepted facts in the case. Compare the reasoning of the two scientists on the same incident. Dr. Henry D. Smyth wrote: "The Chevalier incident involved temporary concealment of an espionage attempt and admitted lying, and is inexcusable. But that was eleven years ago; there is no subsequent act even faintly similar . . ." Thus Dr. Smyth assumes that Dr. Oppenheimer is *now* telling the truth, when he might have been telling the truth in 1943. Or he might have lied both times. All that is clear is that he could not have been telling the truth both times. The open chances are two to one that he was not telling the truth in 1954. Since, however, the dice in this game of probability are loaded in ways we cannot measure, there is no point in having a firm opinion about Oppenheimer's veracity in 1954. You just do not know. Dr. Smyth writes as if he knew. This is not a credit to scientific intelligence.

Dr. Ward V. Evans, scientist, also voted to clear Dr. Oppenheimer who, he said, was "extremely honest." Dr. Evans analyzed the Chevalier incident as follows: "Dr. Oppenheimer in one place in his testimony said that he had told 'a tissue of lies.' What he had said was not a tissue of lies; there was one lie."

If that is scientific intelligence, I'll take Gracie Allen.

Mr. Evans had eight years service with the Atomic Energy Commission, ending as Chief of Training. As part of this position he was specifically asked to give his time to the problem of security education and training. He resigned in March, 1952, only when he found none of his recommendations were being acted on. He is the author of *The Secret War for the A-Bomb* (Regnery, 1953). At present, Dr. Evans is is coordinator of Facts Forum.

Additional Copies of Section II (the article section): 6 for $1; 10 for 1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates are as follows: Trial subscription for new subscribers only — 8 weeks, $1; one year subscription, $10.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED